

The Smithfield Board of Historic and Architectural Review held its regular meeting on Tuesday, December 21st, 2021, at the Smithfield Center. The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m.

Members present:

Trey Gwaltney – Chairman
Julia Hillegass – Vice Chairman
Judith Lally
Laura Brown
Justin Hornback

Members absent:

Russell Hill
Gary Hess

Staff present:

William H. Riddick, III – Town Attorney
Tammie Clary – Community Development & Planning Director
Nadya Jaudzimas – Administrative Assistant
Judy Winslow – Director of Tourism
Jennifer England – Director, Isle of Wight County Museum

Press: None

Citizens: 4

Chairman Gwaltney welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Community Development & Planning Director's Report:

Tammie Clary, the Community Development and Planning Director, reported that the consultants for the 2020/2021 Comprehensive Plan will be present at the January Planning Commission meeting with a draft for review.

Mrs. Clary reported that 100 Commerce Street received a stop work order for a fence that had been built. Once a signed BHAR application is received, it can be brought for review.

She added that 116 South Mason Street erected handrails without approval. They will also receive a stop work order and a BHAR application will be requested.

Upcoming Meetings and Activities:

Monday, December 27th, 3:00 PM – Town Council Committee Meetings
Tuesday, December 28th, 3:00 PM – Town Council Committee Meetings
Tuesday, January 4th, 2022, 6:30 PM – Town Council Meeting
Tuesday, January 11th, 2022, 6:30 PM – Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, January 18th, 2022, 6:30 PM – Board of Historic & Architectural Review Meeting

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Board Member Comments:

Mrs. Hillegass asked if Mrs. Clary could update the board on new zoning that is being considered for the Comprehensive Plan and reported that there had been a public comment at the last Planning Commission meeting about the new mixed-use zoning that is being considered. She

added that the commenter had been hopeful that the Historic District would be omitted from this type of zoning.

Mrs. Clary confirmed that Town staff had prepared an updated article for the planned mixed-use development district that would incorporate residential, commercial, and light industrial zoning while also providing a list of permitted uses that are also listed in the HRC and light industrial district that are by right uses. She added that there was a section that addressed what items would need a special use permit only. Mrs. Clary additionally reported that the comment was from a citizen requesting to not allow the mixed-use permit within the Historic District.

Mrs. Hillegass confirmed with Mrs. Clary and the Town Attorney that this would be up for public hearing on January 11th, 2022.

Signs (Wayfinding) – Various Locations on S. Church Street and Main Street Corridors – Judy Winslow, applicant

Mrs. Clary reported that the applicant is seeking approval to erect and update wayfinding signage in the Downtown area at various locations along the Main Street and South Church Street corridors. The signage will be used to welcome and direct citizens and tourists to public parking locations, shops, restaurants, attractions, lodging options, and the visitor center. There will be a total of sixteen (16) signs placed between this area.

Mrs. Clary reported that there will be two larger public parking signs with one located on the Bank of Southern Virginia (BSV) and a second sign on the Smithfield Foods building.

Mrs. Clary stated that the sign at the old Smithfield Times building will be refaced to read “Main Street Square.” She noted that the frame and sign at this location already exist, and Public Works will repair and repaint the structure accordingly.

She added that a “Welcome to Smithfield” sign will have a yellow, teal, and green background. The phrase “Welcomes You” and “Genuine” will be printed in white lettering with black background to give the words a three-dimensional look. The name “Smithfield” will be filled with pictures that define the Town of Smithfield’s character. The top and bottom border of all the signs will have a smaller square pattern with various colors of green, red, yellow, and blue. The sign will be placed at the corner of Main Street and the Route 10 Bypass near the pig statue.

Mrs. Clary stated that there will be two public parking signs that will be double-sided and located across from the Post Office on Main Street and the Public Parking lot on the 400 block of Main Street.

She stated that there would be various other signs throughout Main Street and South Church Street. She went into detail of sign locations as follows:

- (1) Light post near the corner of Main Street and South Church Street in front of Christ Episcopal Church.
- (2) Light post in front of the Chamber of Commerce Building.
- (3) Light post at entrance to Isle of Wight County Museum on Main Street.
- (4) Light post in front of 308 Main Street, the Nelms House.
- (5) Light post in front of 330 Main Street.
- (6) Light post at the corner of Main Street and Underwood Lane.
- (7) Install new pole and sign just past the entrance to Church Manor Apartments on the same side of the street heading into town.

(8) Light post beside 379 South Church Street with new public parking sign.

(9) Install new pole and sign in front of 123 South Church Street and relocating an existing Windsor Castle Park sign to the new pole.

Mrs. Clary reported that Town staff recommended approval as submitted and deferred to the BHAR for architectural discretion.

The applicant, Judy Winslow of 110 Ellisville in Louisa, was present to answer any questions the board may have. She stated that she had been asked by multiple entities within the Town to put together a wayfinding plan for the downtown area. She added that much planning had been done with the Town Engineers and the Planning and Zoning Department and all involved felt that these signs would benefit visitors and residents to help figure out where they need to go to access different areas of downtown. Mrs. Winslow said that they wanted to ensure that all the signs had a uniform appearance and that it would be clear that these were wayfinding signs.

Mrs. Lally inquired as to whether a sign could be placed at Cedar Street directing traffic to Windsor Castle Park instead of down Jericho Road.

Mrs. Winslow stated that the current signs do not direct traffic down Jericho Road to Windsor Castle Park but down Cedar. She added that they do try to keep people from going that direction and keep them on Cedar.

Mrs. Clary stated that part of the placement plan on sign (9) was to move it creating more time between the sign and the turn onto Cedar Street.

Mrs. Winslow stated that they had deemed the sign there currently as too close to the turn and that it was very easy to miss. She stated that more time to react between the sign and the turn would enable people to get to the appropriate route to the park.

Mrs. Lally stated it would be beneficial to limit the amount of traffic on Jericho Road as it is being damaged by frequent use.

Mrs. Hillegass made a motion to approve the application as presented and Mrs. Lally seconded. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Material/Color Change (Siding) – 206 Cary Street – Contributing – Ryan Smith, applicant

Mrs. Clary stated that the applicant was seeking approval to replace the existing faded yellow siding with CertainTEED Main Street Vinyl Siding in a Sterling Gray color, which would complement the existing red roof. The applicant is also considering a Desert Tan color which is the closest match to the existing siding and is open to using either color.

She reported that Town staff recommended approval from a zoning standpoint as submitted and deferred to the BHAR for architectural discretion.

The applicant, Ryan Smith of 103 Monroe Court in Carrollton, was present for questions from the board. Mr. Smith stated that he had opted to replace all the siding as there were many spots that needed repair and he wanted the siding to look uniform. He stated that he had 12-15 companies come out to give estimates, and only one person got back to him. This person had stated that only two of the CertainTEED colors of siding were available at this time – the Sterling Gray and Desert Tan options.

Chairman Gwaltney inquired as to whether he had removed a railing on the front of the house. Mr. Smith clarified that the online tool that allowed you to see what the different colors would look like on your home had edited it out in the process, but the railing was still present on the house.

Mr. Hornback asked if there had been any consideration as to whether a different material than vinyl could be used.

Mr. Smith stated that he had gotten a verbal estimate on HardiePlank, but it was significantly more affordable to replace with vinyl.

Chairman Gwaltney inquired as to what the plan for the property would be.

Mr. Smith stated that he would be selling it as it was no longer needed for a family members use, as had originally been planned. He added that this would be one of the last of the renovations needed. He stated that he had been trying to have the siding done for around a year and that it had been hard to get anyone to give an estimate after seeing the difficulty involved. Mr. Smith elaborated that there were several different types of materials layered on the house and attaching new siding to the existing structure was going to be a challenge.

Mr. Hornback confirmed with the board members that they were considering synthetic material because it had been grandfathered in and was existing on the property.

Mr. Smith elaborated that if the total replacement doesn't get approved then he will have to patch the different areas in need of repair which will not match the existing vinyl siding.

Chairman Gwaltney stated that the board would not have an issue with either color, but the material needed to be discussed.

The Town Attorney confirmed as it had been grandfathered in, the decision had already been made regarding the material.

Mr. Hornback made a motion to approve as presented with a note that the existing synthetic siding was grandfathered in. Mrs. Hillegass seconded the motion. The board agreed that either color was fine, it would likely come down to availability. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Accessory Structure (Shed) – 210 Drummonds Lane – Non-Contributing – Daniel Towns, applicant

Mrs. Clary reported that the applicant is seeking approval to erect a seven-foot (7') by seven-foot (7'), 49 square feet, Craftsman Resin Gable-Style Storage Shed. The proposed shed will be eight feet (8') tall; it will feature a gray-like color siding with a brown-colored roof. Metal hinges will attach two (2) doors to the structure; the doors will be a darker gray-like color than the siding color. The roof will feature a total of four (4) skylights, two (2) on each side of the top.

She stated that the Town staff recommended approval as submitted from a zoning standpoint and deferred to the BHAR for architectural discretion.

The applicant was not present to answer board questions.

Mr. Hornback stated that the guidelines were clear that outbuildings should match the main house in material and style, and the shed does neither. Mrs. Hillegass agreed.

Mr. Hornback made a motion to reject the application as presented due to the outbuilding not matching the main house's material or style. Mrs. Hillegass seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion to reject passed.

Accessory Structure (Fence) – Lot 182A Riverview Avenue – Non-Contributing – Mesa Construction C/O Marvin Smith, applicant

Mrs. Clary reported that the applicant is seeking approval to erect a six-foot (6') white vinyl fence connecting to the proposed dwelling, on the left side of the property, and continue down the side of the property and will stop with a ninety (90) degree right hand turn right before the benches. The fence will be used to separate their property from the adjoining park, which has a lot of foot traffic. The applicants are seeking approval for vinyl material due to maintenance reasons. This application was tabled at the October 19th, 2021 meeting to allow for a survey of the property to be completed showing the location of the fence.

Town staff recommend approval under the following conditions and defer to the BHAR for architectural discretion:

1. Town staff recommend the fence be wooden and painted white or stained.
2. The fence cannot be erected until after the zoning permit for the new single-family dwelling has been issued.

Marvin Smith of 10283 Newport Street in Battery Park was available to answer questions from the board. Mr. Smith recapped that at the October 19th meeting it had been discussed to turn the fence before benches to keep the view of the water from Riverview Park. Mr. Smith had been able to meet with the Town Engineer, Mr. Griffin, at the property to discuss placement of the benches. Mr. Smith reported that Mr. Griffin had suggested that he would prefer that the applicant would move the benches to just beyond a tree past the end of the fence. He added that they could let them clear an area on the Owens property allowing for the park to have a view. He stated that this would be a 12–14-foot difference from the end of the fence. Mr. Smith added that he believed the benches belonged to the Town of Smithfield, he was unsure who installed them, and they were installed on the Owens's property. He stated that Mr. Griffin suggested that he would be fine with moving them and placing them back on the Smithfield's property.

Mr. Gwaltney wanted to clarify that what they were looking at was a little different than what was presented.

Mr. Smith passed around a plat completed by Canada Surveying of what Smithfield's property lines versus the Owens's property lines. He stated that they would just go to the tree with the fence, do a 90° turn, allow the town to move the benches, and allow them to clear the area preserving the park's view. He stated that the Owens's had purchased the property, thereby purchasing the view, but they were willing to work with the Town to ensure that the park retained its view. Mr. Smith stated the fence was to keep a separation between the two properties.

Mrs. Clary stated that Mr. Griffin did come back with the proposal, but it had not been approved by the Director of Public Works at this time.

Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Griffin had reported that he would contact him, but he thought this might have to be pushed to next month. He added that he had really wanted to get the vinyl portion of the fence approved. Mr. Smith stated that this was considered a Non-Contributing property and that this was a large park with them already having to deal with encroachment issues. He added that they would like to build the fence prior to getting the zoning approved for the proposed dwelling, with it starting from where the benches were located. Once the structure was built the fencing would connect with the dwelling.

Mr. Gwaltney stated that there were two points that the board was hung up on:

1. The blocking of the view.
2. The material of the fence.

Mrs. Brown stated that she was concerned about the height of the fence. She added that she preferred use of a lower, more natural material from at least the pivot point of the fence out.

Mr. Smith stated that having a lower fence would not address any encroachment issues as someone could jump a 4-foot fence. He added that living next to a park made the properties look contiguous and privacy is needed.

The Town Attorney stated the height should not be an issue because they had allowed 6-foot fences in Town previously, and the other part of the issue is where the fence would be located, as theoretically he could go as far down the property as he wanted. He added that they had already made an accommodation for the view. Mr. Riddick stated that this would leave the issue of the material used.

Mr. Hornback stated that in the guidelines there is a question mark regarding white plastic fences and questioned the history of that question mark.

Mr. Smith stated that he had seen the question mark in the guidelines and thought it may be regarding a composite of some sort. He added that the material that they were going to use if approved was more expensive than wood and would not be cheap vinyl.

The board members had a discussion regarding where the question mark was in the guidelines regarding white plastic fences, and how it had gotten there.

Mrs. Hillegass stated that they needed to investigate the question mark issue. She added that the fence looked better to her than some of the fences they had previously approved.

Mr. Smith brought up that there were other vinyl fences in Town, and they wanted to keep it clean and easy to maintain. He added that there had been many changes to fencing materials at this point.

The Town Attorney pointed out that the guideline pertains to fences in view from the street.

Chairman Gwaltney stated that he would interpret street to mean public view, and this fence would be within public view.

Mr. Smith stated that they had put much thought into the look of the fence knowing it was adjacent to the park and within public view. He stated that he felt the fence they were asking for would look better than a wood fence that was painted or stained and be easier to keep pristine over time.

Chairman Gwaltney stated that he felt the issue of the view had been addressed, that was the owner's property, and they could put up a fence.

Mr. Smith stated that they were willing to work with the Town and make accommodations to keep everyone happy.

Mrs. Lally stated that she did not have any issue with the height of the fence, her issue was with the materials. She added that there have been plenty of people who have been turned down for vinyl fences in the Historic District and have put up wooden fences that they were able to maintain.

Chairman Gwaltney addressed the point that there were other houses in the Historic District with vinyl fences, stating that there were many things that were in the district that the board would not have approved, many that had been done before there was a board.

Mrs. Brown stated that she was against the vinyl material being used, adding that this fence would not be in the back of the property but where it would be seen.

Mrs. Hillegass asked Mr. Smith what the alternative would be if they turned him down and required wood.

The owner, Kimberly Lowry, was present and stated that they would have to go to a dog-eared fence, as that was their only other option. She added that with the great length of the fence a wood material could be maintained, but it would never look as clean.

Mr. Smith brought up that the type of fence that they are proposing looks good on both sides, whereas with a wood fence the structural side would be visible as well giving it a good and a bad side.

Mr. Gwaltney inquired as to whether they would put any other fencing up on the property. Mr. Smith stated he did not think so.

Mr. Gwaltney asked if Mr. Smith could give an estimate on how much of the purpose of the fencing from the angle to the benches is for privacy.

Mr. Smith stated that it was waterfront and there were plans for a future pier on the property. He added that the point right between the benches is the closest point to the water, and the fence all the way down to the end would be where privacy is needed the most. The concern then would be people trying to access the pier without permission.

The Town Attorney asked the board if their objection to the vinyl is synthetic or because it is shiny. He pointed out that there were many newer vinyl products that were matte finish or designed to look like wood.

Mr. Smith stated that it was similar to the Everlast siding that will be used on the house. He added that it is a vinyl product, and it had been previously approved by the BHAR. He stated that he would be willing to bring in some samples for the board to see and feel.

Mrs. Brown stated that when she thinks of vinyl fence, she thinks of it as white, shiny, and if something knocks into it, the fence cracking and the clean-up involved. She inquired about the alternative materials available.

Mr. Smith stated he would bring the board some samples but would like to try to resolve the matter at the next meeting.

Chairman Gwaltney asked if the fence panels would sit directly on the ground, or would it be attached to fence posts that would offer clearance.

Mr. Smith stated that it would be mounted with just enough clearance for proper maintenance with a weed eater. He confirmed that there would a cap on the post tops that the panels would be mounted to.

Mrs. Hillegass made a motion to table the issue until the next meeting to review samples of the product.

Mr. Smith asked if the Town Engineer's bench placing could be included within the motion. Mr. Gwaltney stated that the board didn't have control over that, and Mrs. Clary stated that she would work on that information.

Mr. Hornback seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion to passed.

Chairman Gwaltney expressed appreciation the applicant for their understanding and working with the board.

Exterior Changes (Handrails) – 309 Main Street – Non-Contributing – Mesa Construction C/O Marvin Smith, applicant

Mrs. Clary reported that the applicant is seeking approval to install two (2) sets of handrails on the stairs that are located at right side of the building. The handrails will be constructed using one-inch (1") by four-inch (4") treated lumber and will follow the pattern of the stairs currently located on the property.

She added that from a zoning standpoint, Town staff recommended approval as submitted and deferred to the BHAR for architectural discretion on staining or painting white.

Marvin Smith of 10283 Newport Street in Battery Park was available to answer questions from the board. He reported that the applicant has two sets of steps that at the side of the building into an alleyway that do not have handrails. The applicant's insurance company has stated that they must have handrails as they part of fire escape routes. They would like to put up a minimal handrail that is to code, 1x4 type, stained railing. He added that it would not be nailed to the bricks but would be on the outside of the stairs.

Mr. Hornback questioned if the small tree in front of the stairs would have to be removed, to which Mr. Smith stated that it would stay and when it was in season would provide foliage to block the view of the stairs from the street.

Mr. Hornback stated that he felt it needed to be done, would not be seen from the street, and that he had no issue with it.

Mr. Gwaltney questioned as to whether the double stair would really need handrails down both sides as the door opened outward, blocking one side. He asked if they would be painted or stained.

Mr. Smith stated that they were planning on staining it.

Chairman Gwaltney recommended that they use a wood tone.

Mr. Hornback made a motion to approve as presented. Mrs. Lally seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion to passed.

Sign- 103 Main Street – Landmark – Isle of Wight County Museum C/O Jennifer England, applicant

Mrs. Clary stated that the applicant is seeking approval to erect a Civil War Trails sign in a new location, in front of the Isle of Wight County Museum, near the Ivy Hill Cemetery Landmark Register Sign on Main Street. The proposed sign frame will be forty inches (40”) wide by twenty-four and a half inches (24 ½”) long. The sign will be at a maximum height of forty-five inches (45”). The printed panel inside the frame will be thirty-six inches (36”) wide by twenty-four inches (24”) tall. The panel will be set at a forty-five-degree (45°) angle to make it easy to read. The frame of the sign will be painted brown while the panel will be printed with a blue and red header, black text on a beige-colored background. The panel will present facts and pictures from the Civil War era in the Town of Smithfield.

Mrs. Clary reported that Town staff recommended approval as submitted from a zoning standpoint and deferred to the BHAR for architectural discretion

Jennifer England, of 3905 Queen Elizabeth Drive in Chesapeake, was present to answer any question the board had. She stated that there was previously a Civil War Trails sign about the Battle of Smithfield on South Church Street, but a Verizon truck had hit and taken it out about two years ago. This would be the sign to go up in its place, but since it is referring to the Battle of Smithfield, they wanted it to be placed in the location of the battle. She added that in front of the Museum on Main Street is ideal for that.

Chairman Gwaltney asked for clarification on the sign’s actual placement on the street due to the number of pictures included in the application.

Ms. England stated that if you are in front of the museum looking across the street it will be right next to the Ivy Hill Cemetery sign.

Mrs. Hillegass made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Hornback seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion to passed.

Windows (After-the-Fact) – 360-368 Main Street – Contributing – Yusuf Atay, applicant

Mrs. Clary reported that the applicant is seeking after-the-fact approval for the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows. The decision on whether to approve or deny the applicant's request was tabled at the October 19th, 2021 meeting to allow the applicant the opportunity to answer questions ahead of the November 16th, 2021 BHAR meeting (which was canceled due to a lack of business). She stated that the applicant received an e-mail with a list of questions from Board members and provided Town Staff with the following:

- (1) How many windows are on the structure, and how many did the applicant replace?
 - a. The applicant believes he replaced four (4) windows.
- (2) What type(s) of windows (wood/ vinyl/ composite/ other) are presently installed on the structure, and how many of each type?

- a. They were vinyl and replaced with vinyl. Another window was a different material, and the applicant did not replace it.

(3) Do you have any before and after photographs of the windows that were replaced?

- a. The applicant does not have before and after pictures.

(4) Are there plans to replace more windows on the building? If so, how many?

- a. The applicant would like to replace the remaining windows, so that the all the windows on the building look uniform.

She reported that Town staff conducted an onsite window evaluation and determined that the two windows on the first floor, on the left side of the door are wooden; however, the two windows on the right side are vinyl. It is difficult to be certain but on the second floor the windows appear to be a mix of vinyl and wood. On the right side of the building the first floor features all vinyl windows, except for one wooden window. The second floor has all vinyl windows. On the left side of the building, the first floor are wooden windows, and the second floor has vinyl windows.

She added that Town staff recommended approval as submitted from a zoning standpoint and deferred to the BHAR for architectural discretion.

The applicant was not present to answer any of the board's questions.

Mrs. Hillegass asked Mrs. Clary if she was able to confirm if 4 windows had been replaced.

Mrs. Clary apologized and stated that they were not able to confirm that the 4 windows were replaced. She added that in the email thread included in the packet that the applicant had stated that there were only 14 windows total.

The board members discussed and counted that there were 53 total windows in the structure as shown by the photos included in the packet.

Chairman Gwaltney asked if the application had originally been to replace 14 wooden windows.

Mrs. Clary stated that the original application had been due to a complaint that there were vinyl windows being installed at the location. She stated that the after-the-fact application came because of the Town's staff investigation into the 4 vinyl windows installed. She added that the owner has not applied for the 14 wooden windows.

The Town Attorney asked the board why they do not make him come to the meeting, to understand the process. He added that the other option would be to just let the owner do it, but that would be perpetuating negative behavior.

Mr. Hornback asked if they did reject the approval would the owner have to pull out the 4 vinyl windows and if so, is it even certain which 4 windows were the ones in question.

Mrs. Clary reported they did not know which of the windows had been replaced.

The Town Attorney stated that not following proper procedure had been an ongoing issue at this property.

Mrs. Hillegass made a motion to table the issue until the applicant appears before the Board prepared with specifications and receipts. Mrs. Brown seconded the motion. With no further discussion, Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion to passed.

Approval of the Tuesday, October 19th, 2021, meeting minutes:

The Town Attorney recommended approval of the minutes with clerical revisions.

Mrs. Lally made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Hornback seconded. Chairman Gwaltney called for the vote.

On call for the vote, five members were present. Mr. Hornback voted aye, Mrs. Hillegass voted aye, Mrs. Lally voted aye, Mrs. Brown voted aye, and Chairman Gwaltney voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion to passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.



Mr. Trey Gwaltney – Chairman



Tammie Clary – Community Development &
Planning Director